

## REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, claims 1, 3-6, 12-16, 20 and 22-25 were again rejected under §102 as being anticipated by Crockett ('861) and claims 2, 7-11, 17-19, 21 and 26-30 were again rejected under §103 as being unpatentable over various references. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

With respect to the independent claims 1, 12 and 20, Crockett '861 discloses a system for copying in which updates are transferred from a primary storage controller to a secondary storage controller using a host system data mover. The Office Action again asserts that Crockett '861 discloses the claimed "determining whether a consistent point in time copy of the updates pending for storage on the backup storage device at the time the failure is detected form an intact consistency group." However, the reference to column 3, lines 4-6 in Crockett '861 does not disclose making such a determination. Rather, Crockett '861 here discloses "determining a set of full consistency group recovery rules specific to the secondary storage devices," a different step from that recited in the pending claims.

The Office Action also again asserts that Crockett '861 discloses the claimed "resynchronizing the local storage device" and cites Figure 10, item 1085, of Crockett in support. However, as quoted in the Office Action, item 1085 is a process block to "request primary site to resend missing records" to the secondary at the request of the secondary (column 15, lines 30-33). "Figure 10 is a flow diagram showing a method of collecting information and read record sets for forming consistency groups" [column 4, lines 1-3] and, at this point in the procedure, a failure in the primary site is not at issue. If the primary site was still in a failed state, it would not be able to resend any data to the secondary and if the failure had been repaired, as set forth in the present claims, the changed data would not be moving from the primary to the secondary but, as claimed, would be moving in the opposite direction. The claimed "copying changed data from the remote storage device to the local storage device" is different from Corckett's "requesting [the] primary site to resend missing records" to the secondary site (emphasis added). Thus, Crockett '861 does not, as asserted in the Office Action, disclose the claimed "resynchronizing the local [primary] storage device".

With respect to claims 4, 14 and 23, the Office Action refers again to Figures 10 and 11 and the corresponding description in column 15, lines 44-58. However, as noted

above, Figure 10 (and Figure 11) is directed towards the formation of consistency groups, not to steps taken during a recovery from a failure. Thus, the claimed "withdrawing the pending consistency group, reverting to a prior intact consistency group and allowing the pending consistency group to become the intact consistency group" are not disclosed in either the figures or the corresponding description.


With respect to claims 8, 17 and 27, the Office Action admits that Crockett '861 fails to disclose writing post-failure updates "to the remote storage controller from a remote host" (emphasis added). The Office Action then asserts that Beardsley teaches this step. However, the cited column 4, lines 40-42 refers only to transferring updates from the primary to the remote, a different process for a different reason. Thus, the combination of Crockett '861 and Beardsley fail to render the pending claims obvious.

The Applicant also respectfully asserts that the dependent claims are allowable based on the allowability of the respective independent claims. Consequently, claims 1, 3-6, 12-16, 20 and 22-25 are not anticipated by Crockett '861 and claims 2, 7-11, 17-19, 21 and 26-30 are not rendered obvious by any combination of the cited references and the rejections should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, the claims are believed to be allowable, the Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a favorable Advisory Action is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone if a conversation would expedite prosecution of this case.

This constitutes a request for any needed extension of time. No fee is believed to be due in this instance. The undersigned hereby authorizes the charge of any deficiency of fees submitted herewith, or the credit of any overpayment, to deposit account number 09-0449.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dan Shifrin, #34,473  
Law Office of Dan Shifrin  
14081 West 59<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Arvada, Colorado 80004  
303-403-4510  
303-785-8795 (Fax)

cc: IBM - Tucson